REMARKS

Claims 27 through 39 are in the application, with claims 27-29 and 33 having been amended. Claims 27 and 33 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 27, 30-33, 36, 39-41, 43-44, and 46-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Beyda et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,404,873. Claims 28-29, 34-35, 37-38, 42, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beyda et al. in view of Su et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,463,414. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 33

Amended independent claim 27 is directed to a system that comprises a first sub-conference node, a second sub-conference node, a storage device comprising a party information table, a conference controller a mixing controller, and a mixer. The party information table is to select information to be transmitted to the first sub-conference node and to the second sub conference node and is to store mixing parameters. The conference controller is to restrict access to the party information table. The mixer is to select at least a first portion of conference information and a second portion of conference information received from the first sub-conference node and the second sub-conference node based on the party information table and the mixing controller, and is to transmit the first portion of information to the first sub-conference node at a first time slot and to transmit the second portion of information to the second sub-conference node at a second time slot. Moreover, changing information in the party information table will dynamically change the mixer operation.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned features of amended independent claim 27. In particular, the art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to

suggest 1) a storage device comprising a party information table where the party information table is to select information to be transmitted to the first sub-conference node and to the second sub conference node, is to store mixing parameters, and when information is changed in the party information table, the mixer operation dynamically changed, and 2) a conference controller, to restrict access to the party information table.

Beyda discloses a conference call system comprising a subconference call system. At column 4, lines 40 – 55, Beyda discloses receiving a call setup-request at the subconference call system where the request includes a message identifying the requesting party and the proposed subject matter of interest. Upon receive the request, the subconference call system transmits the call set-up request to a terminal and monitors a connection for an acceptance of a call set-up request. Accordingly, the subconference call system receives call setup requests, transmits requests, and monitors connections. However, nowhere does Beyda disclose or suggest that the subconference system stores anything; it merely receives call requests, setups up calls and monitors.

Accordingly, nowhere can Beyda be seen to disclose or to suggest 1) a storage device comprising a party information table where the party information table is to select information to be transmitted to the first sub-conference node and to the second sub conference node, is to store mixing parameters, and when information is changed in the party information table, the mixer operation dynamically changed, and 2) a conference controller, to restrict access to the party information table. The remaining art of record has been reviewed and is not seen to disclose or to suggest the above-mentioned deficiencies in Beyda.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 27 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claim 33 recites similar limitations as claim 27. In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 33 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicant does not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

April 13, 2007
Date

Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982